

9/11thology.

The Third Truth about 9/11. World Trade Center nuclear demolition.

Interview of Dimitri Khalezov, a former officer of the Soviet nuclear intelligence.

Overview:

This is the first part of an interview and a video-presentation by a certain Mr. Dimitri A. Khalezov, a former officer in the Soviet nuclear intelligence. It is divided into 26 parts, 10 minutes each.

The interview is apparently intended to serve as an introduction to Dimitri Khalezov's new book named "The Third Truth". However, the introduction of the book is followed by quite a detailed explanation of very important particulars of 9/11, and even without the actual book, this video could be considered as some of the most comprehensive 9/11 research ever shown to the public.

In this presentation it is explained in detail how US Government officials used three underground thermo-nuclear explosions to demolish three buildings of the World Trade Center in New York during 9/11 events: the WTC Twin Towers and the WTC building #7. In addition, it is explained why the US Government was obliged to demolish these buildings.

It is claimed here that the US Government has actually three levels of 9/11 "truths". One "truth" – for consumption by the general public (i.e. a version expressed by the 9/11 Commission Report. Another – an "awful" and "confidential" one – for exclusive consumption by middle-ranking officials. And the third one – the real truth, which is known only to high-ranking US- officials and to some foreign dignitaries, to whom it was confided by the US authorities.

It is explained that the Pentagon was struck not by a passenger plane – American Airlines Flight 77 – as claimed by a "public" version of the 9/11 "truth", but by a certain nuclear-tipped supersonic cruise missile which was later found unexploded in the middle of the Pentagon. The US officials were handed information (apparently by some "friendly" secret services) that two more similar nuclear warheads were allegedly planted by a third party in the upper floors of the WTC Twin Towers. The responsible US officials had no choice than to believe that claim, because an unexploded 500 kiloton nuclear warhead found in the Pentagon was a tough means to convince them. Therefore the US officials feared that the entire city of New York could be destroyed by a powerful nuclear airburst if they did not react promptly. It was decided to collapse the WTC Twin Towers by their in-built demolition feature that was, in turn, based on nuclear demolition charges positioned at 77 meters below the earth's surface under each Tower.

Upon exploding deep underground these nuclear demolition charges produced powerful "crushing waves" that were directed upwards and pulverized the entire Towers' bodies up

to 300-350 meters, which caused the Towers to collapse in a very strange manner that was shown on all contemporary 9/11 TV footage.

Dimitri Khalezov claims that he knew about the existence of the WTC Twin Tower's built-in nuclear demolition scheme a long time ago – back in the '80s, when he used to serve as an officer at the Soviet nuclear intelligence. According to him, the Soviet side was informed about the existence of the WTC nuclear-demolition scheme, based on the provisions of a so-called “Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty” between the USSR and the United States which laid obligations to each party to inform the other party of any nuclear explosions for non-military purposes. The WTC nuclear demolition scheme, in turn, existed because of some apparent bureaucratic provisions in the New York Building Code. The Department of Buildings of New York could not issue permissions to build skyscrapers unless some satisfactory demolition scheme was provided in advance. In the case of the incredibly rigid steel Twin Towers it was apparently impossible to bring them down by any conventional controlled demolition methods; therefore it was decided to use underground nuclear explosions, instead of conventional explosives. The Department of Buildings of New York apparently approved such a demolition idea back in the '60s and issued a permit to build the World Trade Center. Since the Twin Towers were built, their in-built nuclear demolition scheme was always in place and ready to be used in case of emergency. In 9/11 such an emergency indeed occurred and the nuclear charges under the WTC were put to use.

The WTC Building #7, according to Khalezov, was demolished by a similar nuclear demolition method – because it was a commanding structure of the entire WTC complex and the US officials later decided to get rid of the WTC-7 in order to hide evidence of the nuclear demolition arrangements from a possible public inquiry. Moreover, according to his claims, the Sears Tower in Chicago too had its in-built nuclear demolition scheme – similar to that used in the Twin Towers and the WTC-7. And this was exactly the reason why the Sears Tower in Chicago was ordered to evacuate during 9/11 events and its evacuation order was transmitted within only 3 minutes after the WTC South Tower's collapse.

The rest of the film deals with various important parts of the 9/11 perpetration and its ensuing governmental cover-up. For example, it is explained and demonstrated by an example of two pre-9/11 English dictionaries, that “ground zero” in pre-9/11 English had no other meaning than “a spot of a nuclear or thermo-nuclear explosion”. It is shown also how in the ensuing 9/11 cover-up the US officials had English dictionaries reprinted in order to re-define the “ground zero” term by “broadening” its former meaning and making its nuclear allusion less conspicuous.

Overview of each part:

Part 01. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IGjUlr30VKE>

Part 01. Introduction. Three complete definitions of the “ground zero” term from three largest, unabridged, encyclopedic pre 9/11 dictionaries are quoted – all having no other sense than “a center of an atomic or a thermo-nuclear explosion”. Mr. Dimitri Khalezov

is introduced next as a former officer of the Soviet nuclear intelligence. He explains that he used to be a commissioned officer of the 12th Chief Directorate of the Defense Ministry of the former USSR, but actually he served in its smaller department which was called “Special Control Service”, otherwise known as the “nuclear intelligence”. The 12th Chief Directorate was an organization in the Soviet Union responsible for safe keeping and for technical maintenance of the entire nuclear arsenal of the state, as well as for nuclear testing. The “Special Control Service” was responsible for detecting nuclear explosions of various adversaries of the former USSR. Therefore Khalezov claims to have a certain experience in regard to nuclear explosions. He claims that he learned from his former service about nuclear demolition of the World Trade Center in New York. It is explained also that the American FBI attempted to link Khalezov to several important terror figures – such as the 9/11 hijackers and 2002 Bali bombers, notably Mr. Hambali, alleged right-hand of Osama bin Laden and the leader of “Jemaah Islamiah” terrorist organization. Khalezov was accused by the FBI of supplying a fake passport to Mr. Hambali and his extradition to America was demanded from Thailand. A certain FBI-composed chart is shown (copied from a court-case) where a certain terrorism structure is depicted. On that chart Khalezov is shown in the same row with a certain Doctor Hadji Muhammed Husseini, who is claimed to be a chief 9/11 perpetrator, with Mr. Hani Hammoer, who is accused of supplying travel documents to the 9/11 hijackers, and with Mr. Hambali – an alleged “Terror Kingpin” as stated by a front page of “Time” magazine. Khalezov says he was arrested on those charges, which charges he has always denied.

Part 02. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKbECfPMwck>

Part 02. The interviewer begins with questioning Khalezov as to why in his book he claimed there were no planes involved in the 9/11 attacks. Khalezov explains how thick the double-walled steel perimeter columns of the Twin Towers were and also shows photographs of these columns in their cross-sections, saying the WTC steel perimeters were actually thicker than a typical tank’s front armor. Judging from the point of view of physics it was not technically possible for empty aluminum planes to penetrate such thick steel, irrespective of the planes’ speeds. Then he proceeds to explain how 9/11 perpetration involved parties actually had the videos manipulated showing the alleged planes’ impacts. As examples are shown two contemporary 9/11 video clips (which were actually not shown “live” on 9/11, but with a strange 17 seconds delay). One clip – from WNYW – shows how an aluminum plane completely penetrated the WTC South Tower that the plane’s nose even stuck briefly from an opposite façade of the Tower. However, there were 12 completely black frames right in the middle of the impact scene which clearly points to a digital manipulation. Another clip – from ABC – shows that while a “plane” that penetrated the South Tower was clearly visible on a TV screen, a reporter on the WTC spot, ABC’s Dan Dahler, who witnessed an actual explosion, says that it was an explosion, and he did not see any plane.

Part 03. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xPKN8ScDIsE>

Part 03. Continue disproving the “planes” theory. Two distinctly different approaching trajectories of the same plane are compared, as shown by two different footages as a proof of digital manipulation with the “planes”. One shows a horizontal approaching

trajectory. Another footage shows a sharply descending trajectory – resembling a diving bomber. Then a photo of an impact hole in the North Tower is shown (the photo appears to be from an official NIST report). The form of the impact hole does not match a silhouette of a plane it purported to represent even remotely. Moreover, a woman is clearly visible in the impact hole's photo, desperately holding to one of the surviving steel beams and apparently looking for help. Considering that this photo was taken seconds before the Tower's collapse, it is clear proof that there was no "high temperature" enough to weaken steel as claimed by the official 9/11 version, because mere presence of that woman in that supposedly "hot" spot effectively disproves the "high-temperatures" notion. Then the discussion moves on to the Pentagon attack. A photograph is presented that shows an approaching trajectory of a flying object that struck the Pentagon. The trajectory is so unique that it by no means could belong to any aircraft – even a military jet-fighter, certainly not a large commercial airliner. Khalezov claims that the Pentagon was attacked not by any plane, but by an anti-ship missile. Even the patten of the Pentagon strike (the missile attempted to strike the target at its "waterline level" clearly reveals typical behavior of an anti-ship missile). It was a Soviet-made "Granit" or P-700 missile (known as "SS-N-19 Shipwreck" by NATO classification). The missile had a weight of 7 tons and flew at the speed of 2.5 Mach, thus it was virtually a flying tank, or a giant bullet that managed to penetrate three rows of the Pentagon's buildings, altogether 6 capital walls. An apparently illegal picture of this top-secret Soviet weapon is presented showing the Granit missile while in a factory. The missile was fired by 9/11 perpetrators from the Atlantic Ocean, perhaps 200 or 300 miles away from the US coast line. It was apparently a seaborne attack even judging by the reaction of the US officials – immediately after the Pentagon was struck they sent their jet-fighters over the Atlantic to guard against further attacks from that side. A photograph of a punched-out hole in the inner Pentagon's wall is shown that is clear evidence of the missile, not a plane.

Part 04. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F_qKB0EdGE0

Part 04. The discussion continues about the Granit missile fired into the Pentagon. The missile was stolen from the Russian "Kursk" submarine (that sunk in the Barents Sea in August 2000). Khalezov claims the missile was equipped with its usual half-megaton thermo-nuclear warhead, because this kind of missile could only be nuclear and it was nuclear. Its warhead, however, failed to detonate on impact and was found unexploded in the middle of the Pentagon. This unexploded thermo-nuclear warhead apparently scared the US officials into demolishing the Twin Towers. At this point Khalezov begins to explain about the in-built nuclear demolition scheme of the Twin Towers. He claims that while serving in the Soviet nuclear intelligence in the '80s he learned about the existence of the WTC demolition scheme, which, by the way, sounded then very ridiculous to his fellow officers and it was a standing joke among them. Khalezov claims that the nuclear demolition scheme of the Twin Towers was designed in the '60s by a world-famous demolition company "Controlled Demolition Inc" ("CDi") based on the requirements of the Building Code of New York. He claims that the Sears Tower in Chicago too has a similar nuclear demolition scheme also designed by the "CDi". Khalezov proceeds to explain that peaceful nuclear explosions were routinely used in the former Soviet Union for various industrial projects such as creating artificial lakes, tunnels, canals,

underground gas-holders and so on, but never for any demolitions. Only the Americans decided to make such an application of a peaceful nuclear explosions concept. The Soviet side was informed of the fact the WTC had its in-built nuclear demolition scheme based on conditions in the “Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty” between the USSR and the United States. Khalezov also claims to remember a public scandal in the ‘80s when a certain person accidentally discovered a blue-print of the Twin Towers nuclear demolition scheme in a library and complained to some newspaper.

Part 05. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EghrPNR9SSQ>

Part 05. The discussion moves on to the results of the Pentagon strike. It is explained that the US officials had indeed contacted the then Russian President Putin to discuss an issue of the Russian nuclear-tipped missile found in the Pentagon. Khalezov claims that if the warhead had exploded, we would not be able to see Washington today, due its being a half-megaton (more than 25 times the size of that of the Hiroshima bomb). A so-called “Doomsday Plane” is discussed. According to Khalezov, the Doomsday Plane’s appearance over the White House on 9/11 was a direct result of the Pentagon missile attack. NORAD apparently managed to detect the approaching “Granit” missile 5 or 6 minutes before it hit the wall of the Pentagon. While still airborne, the missile was quickly identified by NORAD as being a Soviet-made missile with a thermo-nuclear warhead and a standard atomic alert was immediately rung all over the United States. It resulted in an immediate taking of the US Vice-President Dick Cheney and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice by their guards to an underground anti-atomic bunker under the White House. While the House Speaker (being third in a line of succession to the US President) was ordered by the guards to be urgently relocated to another underground bunker by a helicopter (because according to the US contingency plans they can’t keep all top figures of the US Government in the same place). However, according to Khalezov, the Speaker had no chance to survive – because it was too short notice – by the time he was led to a helicopter pad near the White House, the “Granit” missile hit the wall of the Pentagon with an aim of producing a half-megaton thermo-nuclear explosion, powerful enough to incinerate D.C. entirely. Only Cheney and Rice had a chance to survive in this case – it was scarcely enough time for the two to reach their own underground anti-atomic bunker. The Doomsday Plane was scrambled in response to the Pentagon missile attack, because it is a standard procedure – to scramble Doomsday Planes during confirmed nuclear attacks against the United States. That is what the Doomsday Planes are actually meant for. A contemporary 9/11 CNN video clip is shown which shows the Doomsday Plane making circles over the White House on 9/11. The 9/11 Commission Vice-chairman Lee H. Hamilton is questioned in regard to the Doomsday Plane’s 9/11 appearance. He answers he could vaguely recollect it and it seemed to him too unimportant an event even to be brought to a level of discussion within the Commission (never mind to be included into its published Report). Khalezov is asked if it was the first time in the US history that the Doomsday Plane was scrambled as a result of an atomic alert. He answers that he can’t be sure about it, but perhaps it was the first time indeed. However, what he says surely did happen for the first time in the US history is that the incredibly strong safe-like anti-atomic doors of NORAD’s protected command post in the Cheyenne Mountain, Colorado, were ordered to shut. Immediately upon detecting the “Granit” missile on course for Washington, the then commander of

NORAD departed from his peace-time unprotected command post to his protected command post located inside the Cheyenne Mountain. Once he arrived there, he ordered its steel anti-atomic doors (designed to protect the mountain from a large thermo-nuclear blast in its immediate vicinity) to be shut. This has never happened before. It was the first time in American history that NORAD's anti-atomic doors were shut as a result of an atomic alert.

Part 06. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p2_ZKUPmEuI

Part 06. Khalezov says the Twin Towers' collapse had absolutely nothing to do with the fires caused by alleged "planes" and even firefighters who evaluated the fires did not think the Towers could collapse. He says that the Towers were demolished by their in-built nuclear demolition features. However, when it comes to true causes – WHY the US officials decided to demolish the Twin Towers – he says from the beginning he did not have an answer to this question. According to him, when he wrote the first edition of his book and sent it to the American FBI, he got into some informal discussions with the FBI officials and some of them revealed to him that an initial version Khalezov used in his book was wrong. According to the FBI the US officials must have had very strong reasons to demolish the Twin Towers. And this strong reason, according to them, was that someone claimed that there were actually three thermo-nuclear warheads sent to the United States that day, not just one. One of them was found unexploded in the middle of the Pentagon, while the other two were allegedly on the "planes" (or whatever else it was that hit the WTC). The US officials apparently believed there were two more thermo-nuclear warheads that stuck in the upper floors of the Twin Towers and these two were likely to explode and to level the entire city of New York City with half-megaton explosions at high altitude. In order to minimize damage it was decided to collapse the Twin Towers by their in-built nuclear demolition schemes. In other circumstances, perhaps, the US officials would doubt such a claim about alleged "nuclear warheads" in the upper floors, but the real unexploded thermo-nuclear warhead found in the Pentagon earlier was a very convincing argument. A contemporary 9/11 NBC video clip is shown where the NBC's Pat Dawson at 10.02 AM EST, i.e. only 4 minutes after the South Tower's collapse reveals what was told to him by Albert Turi, the Chief of Safety for the New York Fire Department. Pat Dawson quotes Turi as saying that there has been "another explosion" (apparently referring to an explosion that actually collapsed the South Tower) and that he believes there were TWO so-called "secondary devices" (or "other bombs" in context of the said). One of such "secondary devices" might have been on the planes that crashed into one of the Towers. Another of such "secondary devices" was probably planted into the buildings. It is followed by a still frame from contemporary 9/11 CNN footage dated by 10.03 AM that shows only a pile of airborne dust as all that remained of the South Tower. The CNN text in the lower third of the screen reads: "BREAKING NEWS THIRD EXPLOSION SHATTERS WORLD TRADE CENTER IN NEW YORK. CNN Live 10.03a ET". It is followed by the next still frame from the same CNN footage at 10.04a AM. It shows the same picture as above, but a new CNN text below, which reads: "BREAKING NEWS CHICAGO'S SEARS TOWER EVACUATED. CNN Live 10.04a ET". Then it is followed by a third still frame from the same CNN footage – at 10.13 AM. It shows the still standing North Tower alone and the

CNN text below now reads as follows: “BREAKING NEWS THIRD EXPLOSION COLLAPSES WORLD TRADE CENTER IN NEW YORK. CNN Live 10.13a ET”.

Part 07. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mkMnFbvWAsw>

Part 07. Khalezov is asked by his interviewer about his book which suggests that the American Government exploded a nuclear weapon underneath the World Trade Center buildings 1 and 2. Khalezov corrects his interviewer by mentioning that his book does not actually “suggest”; it PROVES that the Towers were demolished by nuclear devices. Secondly, he says that it is not correct to call such a device a “weapon”, because a weapon is something that is primarily intended to kill people, while nuclear demolition devices under the WTC were not intended to kill anyone therefore they could not have the status of a “weapon”. But, still, they were nuclear devices. From this point Khalezov proceeds to explain how such a nuclear demolition scheme actually works. First he refers to an article which he wrote for Wikipedia at a request of some of his followers. He says he wrote an “academic-looking” article in which he explained in purely technical terms how to use a nuclear device to demolish a single skyscraper. However, this article did not exist on Wikipedia longer than a week. It was accused of being a “crazy conspiracy theory” and removed, despite the fact that there was no World Trade Center mentioned in it – it was a purely a technical article, no politics, no conspiracies involved. Khalezov said he was obliged to re-post the removed Wikipedia article which is now available on this new address: www.nuclear-demolition-wikipedia.com Then he proceeds to explain how such a nuclear demolition scheme actually works. First of all, there is a big difference between an atmospheric- and an underground nuclear explosion. Many people confuse them and it seems that it is difficult for many of them to comprehend that an underground nuclear explosion was indeed used to demolish the Twin Towers without causing typical “atomic” damage to their surroundings. Then Khalezov proceeds to explain the physical properties of an atmospheric nuclear explosion and those of its main destructive factors: air-blast wave, thermal radiation, ionizing radiation, radioactive contamination and EMP (Electromagnetic pulse). He explains in detail that some air is needed for the creation of the two main destructive factors of an atomic blast – i.e. its air-blast wave and thermal radiation. Therefore neither of these two factors could pertain to an underground nuclear explosion due to the absence of air in such a case.

Part 08. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4gJLCrPi_Mo

Part 08. Khalezov explains the physical properties of a deep underground nuclear explosion followed by graphical illustrations. The main sense of the explanation is that neither any air-blast wave, nor thermal radiation could be created in the case of an underground nuclear explosion. When it comes to ionizing radiation – it will be created even by an underground nuclear explosion, but it can’t travel up to the earth’s surface, because it will be stopped by surrounding rock. Almost the entire explosive energy of an underground nuclear charge will be used, instead, on creating an underground cavity which will result from the disappearance of the evaporated rock. An exact size of such a cavity could be calculated in advance, because it is known that 1 kiloton of nuclear munitions could evaporate about 70 tons of dry granite rock. Khalezov says that in the case of the World Trade Center 150-kiloton nuclear charges were used. When asked why he knew the exact yield he laughs and answers that he knew it from his former service in

the Soviet nuclear intelligence, and, besides, the Americans could not use more powerful nuclear devices anyway because 150 kiloton was a legal limitation imposed by the “Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty” between the United States and the Soviet Union. That is why they were exactly 150 kiloton. Such a 150 kiloton underground nuclear explosion could create an underground cavity of roughly 100 meters in diameter (50 meters radius). Khalezov explains also that gases which were formerly rock inside the underground cavity would crush neighboring areas of the rock by their high pressure. As a result two unique zones of destruction would be created around the underground cavity. One – immediately adjacent to the cavity that in nuclear jargon is called “crushed zone” – will be filled with completely pulverized microscopic material, each particle of it comparable with the diameter of a human hair. All materials within this zone will be reduced to complete microscopic dust – steel, granite, concrete and even human beings. The next zone around the “crushed” one that in nuclear jargon is called the “damaged zone” will be filled with materials broken to smaller debris, but not to complete dust.

Part 09. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k_d9gzYl4go

Part 09. Discussion about the actual physical processes of an underground nuclear explosion continues followed by animated graphical illustrations. Khalezov explains also that rock from the so-called “crushed zone” could retain for a while its original color and shape. If you very carefully pick up a stone from that area it looks like it was before the nuclear explosion – the same shape and the same color. However, when you press it even slightly with your fingers it will instantly turn to complete microscopic dust. Khalezov repeats that people standing on the earth’s surface can not be injured by the third destructive factor of a nuclear explosion – i.e. by its ionizing penetrating radiation, because it will be absorbed by surrounding areas of the rock and can not reach the earth’s surface. However, it does not mean that you can stand above such a spot of a recent underground nuclear explosion. The problem is that highly-radioactive gases that are under high pressure inside the cavity eventually will find their way out and will reach the earth’s surface via some crevices in the rock. Therefore people on the surface could still get some radiation injury by these radioactive gases which represent in this case the destructive factor No.4 (radioactive contamination). That is why, according to Khalezov, the United States and the Soviet Union carried out their underground nuclear testing only in remote areas. However, according to him, a layer of soil that lays between the upper end of the underground cavity and the earth’s surface will act in this case like a filter. The thicker the filter, the less radioactivity will be carried up to the earth’s surface and into its atmosphere. For 150 kiloton nuclear explosion detonated in granite rock a “safe” depth will be 500 meters deep underground, because in this case there would be at least 400 meters of remaining rock on top of the cavity to act as a filter. But even in such a case it would be prohibited for people to stay about the spot of such a deep underground nuclear explosion for at least 2 weeks – i.e. during time the radioactive gases are finding their way into the atmosphere. But when it comes to visiting an actual hypocenter of a nuclear explosion (i.e. a cavity left by such a 150 kiloton nuclear charge) it is impossible to go there until at least 3 years have passed, because it is deadly radioactive and also extremely hot inside. Asked how long it would keep heat, Khalezov answers that it would stay hot for at least 1 year. Asked about the actual demolition arrangement of the WTC he answers that 500 meters “safe” distance for detonating of a 150 kiloton nuclear charge

in granite rock was applicable to a typical nuclear test, not to a specific demolition task. In the case of the WTC demolition charges were positioned not too deep. The explanation is followed by a graphical scheme where it is shown that an underground part of each Twin Tower was 27 meters below ground level. The nuclear charges were positioned another 50 meters below that point (or 77 meters below the surface level). In this case their explosion would create a cavity of 50 meters radius, so that the upper end of the cavity would reach exactly the lowest underground foundations of the Tower, but would not reach the earth's surface.

Part 10. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IkyqjufFYNA>

Part 10. Continuation of the discussion about the actual WTC nuclear demolition scheme started in the previous part. Here Khalezov explains that geometrical forms of the cavity and the surrounding “crushed zone” and “damaged zone” would be ideally “round” and concentric only when a nuclear charge was positioned ideally deep underground. Because in such a case the resistance of materials from every direction would be the same. When a nuclear charge is positioned not too deep the remaining thin layer of rock on top of it would provide much lesser resistance compared to that from beneath or from the sides. As anything is known to expand by the way of least resistance the pressure of evaporated rock inside the cavity in this case will try to expand it by the way of least resistance also – which will be the way upwards in this case. As a result, instead of a round form, the cavity will have the form of an “egg” with its sharper end facing upwards. The “crushed” and “damaged” zones around the cavity will too have forms of an “egg”. If the upper end of this “egged” structure reaches the lowest underground foundations of the Tower above it, it will meet there even less resistance, because granite rock around is more or less a solid and strong material, while the Tower is half empty and provides a very different resistance in the sense of resistance of materials compared to granite rock. Therefore once these “damaged” and “crushed” zones reached the Tower body on their way upwards they would continue to propagate upwards through the Tower's body, crushing its steel beams and internals alike into complete microscopic dust typical to the “crushed zone”. Asked if people would hear the sound of an enormous explosion in this case Khalezov answers that there will be no sound and nothing at all to feel, except the feeling of an earthquake, which could be compared to the feeling of a train running underneath. He says that a 150 kt nuclear explosion should produce an earthquake with a magnitude of around 5.7 on the Richter scale. This is also confirmed by an excerpt from an official seismic table where 5.5 on Richter scale pertains to 80 kiloton, and the next digit – 6.0 pertains to 1 Megaton (i.e. 1.000 kilotons) yield. An original 9/11 footage (a famous clip by Etienne Sauret) that shows how the North Tower's top shook visibly 12 seconds before its collapse is inserted to confirm this. The video indeed shows how the North Tower's top first shook (apparently because of some sort of earthquake), and then, 12 seconds later, it suddenly began to move downwards, crushing the Tower's body beneath itself as if it were not a steel structure, but a pile of dust. Khalezov proceeds to explain this phenomenon in detail, which is followed by animated graphics. The strange pattern of the Twin Towers' collapse was because the “damaged” and “crushed” zones could not reach to the very top of the Towers which were more than 400 meters tall. The “damaged zone” was able to reach some 350 meters height, while the “crushed zone” was able to reach some 300 meters height. This left the very top of each Tower relatively undamaged

– solid and heavy. In the next second under gravitational forces the undamaged top of the Towers began to press down first spreading some debris that belonged to the “damaged zone”, and then – continuing to spread only fine dust which almost the entire length of the Towers (~300 meters) was reduced to.

Part 11. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MPIVaNB9JqI>

Part 11. Continuation of the discussion on the distribution of “damaged” and “crushed” zones along the Twin Towers’ bodies started in the previous part, which is followed by several examples of the 9/11 footage that show the way the Towers actually collapsed. The pattern of their collapse perfectly matches Khalezov’s claims in regard to the distribution of “damaged” and “crushed” zones. Asked if it could have been anything other than a nuclear explosion, Khalezov answers that there is no other known physical process capable of reducing the thick steel columns of the Twin Towers into complete microscopic dust. Only a nuclear explosion could do that. Photos of several WTC columns are shown where incredibly thick double-walled cross-sections are clearly visible showing that each wall is comparable with a tank’s armor because of its thickness. It is followed by 9/11 photos showing steel dust in detail during the South Tower’s collapse and also microscopic steel dust that covers oranges and plums of some street vendor near the WTC area. Asked about claims of so-called floor-by-floor “pancake” collapse, Khalezov offers to review footage of the South Tower’s collapse – noticing that the Tower’s top falling downwards does not meet any resistance whatsoever which would supposedly have been offered by the remnants of alleged “floors”. Moreover, no “floors” whatsoever are visible in that footage. All that could be seen is that the South Tower’s top suddenly began to move downwards at near freefall speed as if under it there were not any remnants of incredibly thick steel structures, but only air alone. The footage clearly shows complete microscopic dust which offers no more resistance than would air and it does not reveal any larger debris, not to say alleged “remnants of the floors” which presumably would be the corner stone of the “pancake collapse” theory. This is followed by a contemporary CNN clip that showed the South Tower’s collapse. It is requested to note that only 4 minutes has passed since its collapse, but the Sears Tower in Chicago has already been ordered to evacuate by 10.04 AM EST as appears from CNN’s text on the lower part of the screen. When repeating the South Tower’s collapse footage, the CNN text reads: “MOMENTS AGO BREAKING NEWS THIRD EXPLOSION SHATTERS WORLD TRADE CENTER IN NEW YORK. CNN”. The interviewer asks – does it mean that it was a nuclear device? Khalezov’s reply: of course it was a nuclear device, otherwise, why would they call the place “ground zero”? A quotation is displayed from The American Heritage Desk Dictionary 1981 edition, stating that “ground zero” is “the place on the earth directly at, below, or above the explosion of a nuclear bomb” followed by the Dictionary’s ISBN number. Khalezov says that many people have forgotten what “ground zero” used to mean before 9/11 and it is a good time to remind them. He takes an enormous volume of the Webster’s unabridged pre 9/11 dictionary, perhaps, three times the size of a volume of the Encyclopedia Britannica, and opens it on its “ground” page. The only “ground zero” definition from the dictionary is displayed and read. “Ground zero” is “the point on the surface of the earth or water directly below, directly above, or at which an atomic or hydrogen bomb explodes”. Khalezov jokes – does it say ground zero is a place of pancake collapse? Asked what happened with the “ground zero”

definition after 9/11, he answers that after that the US Government was so embarrassed that the WTC demolition grounds were called by such a revealing name, that it needed to change its legal definition in all future dictionaries; otherwise, people might doubt it. He shows another example. He takes two nearly identical Longman Advanced American Dictionaries of two different additions – a pre-9/11 one and a post-9/11 one – and offers to compare “ground zero” definitions in them. In the first edition “ground zero” has a single meaning (as in all other pre-9/11 dictionaries): “the place where a NUCLEAR bomb explodes, where the most severe damage happens”. In the second, post-9/11 edition the definition is enlarged: 1. “the place where a large bomb explodes, where the most severe damage happens” and 2. “**Ground Zero** the place in New York City where the World Trade Center buildings were destroyed by TERRORISTS on September 11, 2001”. In the first definition the word “NUCLEAR” in capital letters is changed to the word “large”, while the rest is left the same. Khalezov claims that the US Government changed the definition of “ground zero” in all other dictionaries as well, joking that the very English language became one of the victims of 9/11. Discussion moves further to the point whether the dust the WTC was reduced to was radioactive or not. Khalezov says that many people mistakenly think that because the WTC was destroyed by nuclear explosions the dust should be radioactive in the same sense as “radioactive dust” during an atmospheric nuclear explosion. It is wrong to think like this, because during an atmospheric nuclear explosion dust becomes radioactive because it is being sucked from the earth’s surface into a mushroom cloud by high temperatures inside the cloud and it becomes radioactive while there. When the cloud cools down, the radioactive dust falls down causing radioactive contamination. However, in the case of the WTC demolition all radioactive materials were concentrated inside the cavity and dust had nothing to do with any radioactivity, therefore it should not be radioactive. Nonetheless, it will be harmful, because it is a microscopic material which will cause mechanical damage when inhaled. What was really radioactive in the case of the WTC was vapor, not dust. Footage of ground zero is shown where vapor is ascending in huge quantities from underground.

Part 12. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w6peynbB98E>

Part 12. Discussion about radioactive vapors started in the previous part moves on. Khalezov compares the situation described in the part 09 where 400 meters of rock played the role of a “filter” above the spot of a nuclear explosion 500 meters deep underground with a situation in the WTC, where such a layer of remaining rock on top of an underground cavity was thinner than 25 meters. Moreover, he explains using animated graphics, that even these 25 meters of the remaining rock could not actually have served as a filter, because in the next second after the Tower’s collapse they would have fallen into the cavity and melted there at once. Thus there was no “filter” whatsoever in the case of the WTC. It was only a pile of some of the Towers’ debris laying on top of an open hole leading to the underground cavity filled with radioactive materials. That is why all radioactive vapors ascending from the cavity escaped into an atmosphere totally unfiltered and people who worked at ground zero, as well as Manhattan residents, were freely inhaling these radioactive vapors. This is followed by several examples of post 9/11 footage showing ground zero workers walking without any respirators amidst streams of radioactive vapors, and even some Manhattan residents that walk the streets in dangerous proximity to these streams of radioactive vapors. The discussion moves to the

actual composition of the WTC dust. Khalezov explains that it was possible to recognize materials in the dust particles and the greater part of the dust was, of course, represented by steel dust, since steel was the major material used in the Towers' construction. He stresses that the volume of concrete used in the WTC was negligible in comparison with the volume of steel. Some parts of the WTC dust were also represented by furniture dust, carpet dust, computer dust and, of course, human being dust, because human beings were reduced to the same state of materials as steel, concrete and furniture. This is followed by a famous ground zero clip first showing workers working on a pile of debris amidst streams of vapors and comments by a firefighter Joe Casaliggi who says: "...it was 210 storey office buildings, but you don't find a desk, you don't find a chair, you don't find a telephone, a computer; the biggest piece of a telephone he found was a half of the keypad and it was about that big (shows its size with fingers); the buildings collapsed to dust." Asked how hot the cavities would be, Khalezov answers several thousands degrees Celsius, perhaps 8.000 degrees or more. To completely cool down with 150 kiloton it would take about a year. This is followed by a famous piece of footage "Red Hot Ground Zero" shot 6 weeks after 9/11. That footage shows ground zero workers working without any respirators amidst streams of vapors and also shows how some red-hot pieces of metal are being excavated from the WTC pile. Khalezov claims that it is impossible to sustain such high temperatures for 3 months unless it was nuclear explosions involved. Asked if he discredits suggestions that it might have been thermite, Khalezov laughs and answers that thermite could sustain high temperatures for a maximum of fifteen minutes, because it is the very material used in electric welding. Some footage of cutting of a rail with electric welding is shown, in which a red-hot part of cut steel end loses its red color and cools down in less than half-a-minute. Besides, Khalezov stresses that even though thermite could melt steel it does not mean that thermite could reduce steel to dust. Asked why the US specialists did not realize that it was nuclear explosions, and not kerosene, because nuclear explosions effects were pretty obvious, Khalezov answers that the US specialists were perfectly able to realize it, but they could not admit it to the public. He claims that the US Government was obliged to divide the 9/11 so-called "truth" into a few different levels.

Part 13. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3X6-yf82ttg>

Part 13. Khalezov is asked if the 9/11 Commission members were misled into believing its own "kerosene" theory. He answers that it was not so and the 9/11 Commissioners were by no means misled. They were fed just another version of the 9/11 "truth" according to which the three WTC buildings – the Twin Towers and the WTC-7 – were allegedly destroyed by certain Soviet-made portable nuclear suit-cases (mini-nukes) that were obtained by Osama bin Laden from Ukraine. Khalezov says otherwise it would not be possible to explain to the 9/11 Commissioners many things: apparent radiation effects, the "ground zero" name, the Building #7 collapse, because it was not hit by any plane. To substantiate this claim he shows an article by the Spanish El Mundo newspaper while it was still on-line on the El-Mundo's web site (this article was immediately removed from the El Mundo web site once this video presentation appeared on YouTube; therefore this article is no longer available there – it is available only in libraries or in web archives). This article published on September 16, 2001, and titled "**TRAGEDIA / APOCALIPSIS USA MI HERMANO BIN LADEN**", cites certain US officials, as claiming that there is

“latest” information that Al-Qaeda’s emissaries allegedly succeeded buying from Ukraine **3 (three) pieces of Soviet-made mini-nukes known as “RA115” and “RA116”** – which is an extremely seditious claim that in the context of the then recent events, and especially considering that a sub-section of the article was named “Nuclear Peril” could only be interpreted as follows: ***it was allegedly 3 Soviet-made suit-case nukes of Al-Qaeda that actually brought down the three WTC buildings – the Twin Towers and the WTC-7.*** The article’s actual name also leaves no option to doubt as to what they really mean in this particular “revelation” (so it is not surprising at all that such a seditious article was immediately ordered off-line once someone began to refer to it claiming the existence of the second so-called 9/11 “truth”; however, Khalezov supplies a pdf-printed version of that article while it was still on-line, together with the actual video clips of his interview). From this article it appears that the second so-called “truth” about 9/11 blames the WTC-7 demolition on Al-Qaeda as well. Thus the 9/11 Commissioners could be satisfied in regard to otherwise highly suspicious circumstances surrounding the WTC-7 collapse late in the afternoon on 9/11. Khalezov claims that according to the second version of the so-called “truth” of 9/11 intended for the 9/11 Commissioners and other high-ranking officials, Osama bin Laden’s operatives brought nuclear suit-cases and hid them in the Towers’ basements, while the “plane attacks” were only a distraction. In reality the WTC collapses were allegedly caused by nuclear explosions of these portable nuclear devices of Osama bin Laden. The 9/11 Commissioners were advised not to disclose this “awful” “truth” to the general public in order not to scare them with nuclear weapons, and to produce for the public some false report to cover up the story. And the 9/11 Commissioners agreed. The same consideration was applicable, according to Khalezov, to various high-ranking Fire Department officials, who would be convinced to hide the truth from the general public in the same way the 9/11 Commissioners were convinced. Asked if there could be any other explanation for the collapse of the WTC that is physically possible, Khalezov answers “No”.

Part 14. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y0K-nJbB6UI>

Part 14. After briefly talking about why the US officials quickly removed all debris and even shipped them away to another country to avoid any examination, the discussion moves on to the WTC building #7 demolition. It is said that the 9/11 Commission Report did not even mention the WTC-7 collapse, because it was simply impossible to provide any plausible explanation and it was easier just to ignore this fact. Asked to provide his own explanation of the true causes of the WTC-7 demolition Khalezov agrees, but first offers to re-view a few available pieces of footage showing the WTC-7 collapse. Since these videos show a different pattern of the WTC-7 collapse compared to that of the Twin Towers, Khalezov explains first why it so happened from a technical point of view. Using animated graphics he explains that because of the lower height of the WTC-7 compared to the Twin Towers, a nuclear explosion under it was able to pulverize the entire WTC-7 from bottom to top, because its entire height came within the “crushed zone”. Therefore there was not any heavy undamaged top as in the case of the Twin Towers, that might press down and scatter the dust underneath. This conditioned an actual pattern of the WTC-7 collapse after it was completely pulverized. Khalezov also explains that the US Government attempted to blame the WTC-7 demolition on Osama bin Laden. He shows certain contemporary 9/11 BBC footage that was aired at 4.56 PM EST (24 minutes

before the WTC-7 actual collapse). In this footage BBC anchors claim that the WTC-7 has allegedly “collapsed” and it was allegedly another count of a terrorist “atrocious” (besides the fact that the BBC directly blamed the WTC-7 collapse on “terrorists”, another detail should be necessarily noted: considering that the terms an “atrocious device” and an “atrocious” in the politically correct jargon of security officials actually means a “mini-nuke” and a “mini-nuclear bombing” correspondingly, the phrase “terrorist atrocity” especially in the abovementioned context is 100% a synonym of the phrase “mini-nuclear bombing”). It is again stressed that the WTC would actually collapse only 24 minutes after the airing of this BBC footage (leaving us only to guess what kind of “atrocious” nuclear terrorists could supply to the BBC this information in advance). Khalezov again refers to the El Mundo’s article described in part 13, reminding us that according to that article Osama bin Laden allegedly used 3 mini-nukes in his “New York Apocalypse” and “Nuclear Peril”, not two. Asked if these claims of the three alleged Osama bin Laden’s mini-nukes allegedly used to demolish the three WTC buildings were a part of a cover-up story for “patricians”, Khalezov answers “Yes”. Asked what was his own opinion in regard to the true causes of the WTC-7 demolition, Khalezov answers that the WTC-7 was a command center of the entire WTC complex. According to him, the nuclear demolition devices were not kept under the WTC-1 and -2, but were kept, instead, under the WTC-7 where it was easy to maintain them. At the time of the actual demolition, these nuclear charges had to be delivered under the targeted Towers by some mini-railways made in some underground tunnels. He proceeds to explain why the WTC Tower that was first hit by “a plane” collapsed second and vice-versa – a 9/11 phenomenon which nobody has been able to explain so far. Why it was not possible to demolish the Twin Towers in the same order they were struck by the “planes”. An explanation, according to Khalezov, is very simple. It is because one of the Twin Towers was closer to the WTC-7, while the other was farther from it. And so were the delivery tunnels: one was shorter and one – longer. It was not possible to demolish the “closer” Tower first because an underground nuclear explosion would damage the “longer” delivery tunnel by its subterranean shock. It is illustrated by some graphics showing the World Trade Center map. Due to this consideration it was only possible to demolish the “farther” Tower first, and then only – the “closer” Tower. And so it was done on 9/11. Thus the order of the Twin Towers’ collapse has nothing to do with the order of the “terrorist planes” striking them. Then, according to Khalezov, those who demolished the Twin Towers, decided to demolish the WTC-7. Otherwise a possible inquiry might find all those delivery tunnels and other nuclear stuff under the WTC-7 and it would be very difficult to explain what it was. Luckily, the WTC-7 too was scheduled to be demolished by the same kind of nuclear demolition arrangement; therefore they had 3 nuclear charges actually. That is why they decided to use the third nuclear charge to destroy Building 7 and to hide the evidence completely.

Part 15. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mjCdYHan2Q4>

Part 15. Discussion regarding the true causes of the WTC-7 demolition moves on. The WTC-7 demolition was pure hiding of evidence, an earlier part of the would be 9/11 cover-up. The interviewer wonders – why would not the American officials honestly admit to public that they were obliged to demolish the Twin Towers due to fears that otherwise a few millions of New Yorkers might die? Khalezov answers that even though

such an explanation would sound justifiable, it would be very difficult to explain to general public what the nuclear devices were doing under the World Trade Center in the first instance. Were the US officials expecting some terrorist attacks, that they placed their own nuclear devices under the Twin Towers (or just because of some bureaucratic clause in the New York building code)? The public would apparently never accept this and the responsible US officials realized this when planning their 9/11 cover up. The interviewer asks why would the US officials launch two wars against innocent people on the basis of something they knew wasn't true? Khalezov answers that this, in fact, was quite explainable because it was a very common step of political technology. It was described in "1984" by Orwell. Khalezov gives an example – when there occurred a nuclear bombing in Beirut in 1983 against US Marines barracks, the US Government had no choice then but to launch a war against Grenada the very next day. Just in order to distract a public attention from a nuclear explosion in Beirut towards the occupation of Grenada. But it was a smaller thing (because in Beirut a typical mini-nuke less than 1 kiloton was used). In New York it was a much bigger event (three thermo-nuclear explosions 150 kiloton each), so a war should be bigger as well, in order to distract the public attention appropriately. So, it appears to Khalezov that launching two wars against Iraq and Afghanistan was quite reasonable, in their view, considering the circumstances. The interviewer moves on saying that the WTC Building #7 housed the largest offices of the US secret services, the Mayor of New York's Emergency Operational Center, all these offices had kept in them some legal materials. Does Khalezov think the WTC-7 demolition might have anything to do with an intention to destroy these legal materials? Khalezov answers he does not think so. The WTC-7 demolition had only something to do with the hiding of the existence of the WTC nuclear demolition scheme and if some incriminating materials were destroyed as a result, it was merely coincidence. Asked if there must have been some safety device regarding the WTC nuclear demolition scheme, Khalezov answers that there must have been some alarm system that would produce alarm signals transmitted towards the dangerous area that was about to be demolished. However, he says, if one reviews carefully a published time-table of 9/11, a strange thing will be found: early in the morning September 11 this alarm system was turned off. And nobody can explain why. So, when they actually pressed the Red button to demolish the WTC (and they pressed them inside the WTC) there was no alarm signal produced. Asked if these people who turned off the alarm system had some advanced knowledge of the possible planes' attacks Khalezov answers he does not think so. He thinks it was a kind of conspiracy. The discussion then moves on to the exact positioning of the demolition charges under the WTC and their effects on other buildings. Khalezov is asked how he was able so precisely to calculate their exact positioning in his book. He answers that it was quite easy, if you look at the picture of the World Trade Center. Using a large background 3D map of the WTC, he explains which buildings were pulverized and which were simply damaged. Particularly interesting, according to Khalezov, is the fact that a building behind the WTC-7 (Fiterman Hall located 30 West Broadway) was also damaged. It is very easy to understand why it was damaged. He shows a map of the WTC complex where it is clear that the WTC-7 had the form of a trapezium if to look at it from above. This "trapezium" occupied only a half of an imaginary full circle. In order to demolish such a structure by an underground nuclear explosion a nuclear charge had to be positioned outside of the actual "trapezium" perimeter – exactly in the middle of the

imaginary full circle. Only in this case its zone of destruction (which is round) would “embrace” the entire “trapezium” of the WTC-7 and so it was in the case of its nuclear demolition. The nuclear charge was obviously positioned at the spot described above. Therefore it would produce an equal zone of destruction not only in the first half of the imaginary full circle (that was occupied by the WTC-7 “trapezium”) but in the second half of it as well. And that second half slightly touched the Fiterman Hall on the other side of the road. That is why the Fiterman Hall too was damaged by the nuclear explosion despite standing visibly far from the WTC-7. A photograph showing damage to the Fiterman Hall is shown. It shows damage to one of its corners that perfectly correspond to the described positioning of the nuclear charge. The Fiterman Hall had to be demolished later due to its being “contaminated” as claimed in certain related Internet articles found immediately via Google-search. However, the US Post Office and Verizon Buildings standing much closer to the WTC-7 were not seriously damaged. This, yet another 9/11 phenomenon, could be easily understood from the drawings shown in this presentation.

Part 16. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GOws308624I>

Part 16. The discussion moves further to the exact positioning of the nuclear demolition charges under the Twin Towers. Khalezov shows in the same map that both nuclear charges were not exactly under the Twin Towers’ footprints, but rather under some spots of their perimeters. This conditioned some surviving corners of the lower perimeters of each of the Twin Towers – exactly opposite the positions of the nuclear charges. Khalezov shows some photographs of these surviving corners as well and provides comprehensible explanation supported by animated graphics that shows why these lower parts of the steel Towers’ perimeters were spared by the crushing waves that pulverized the rest of the Twin Towers’ bodies. Later a big official NOAA photograph dated September 23, 2001 is shown. In this photograph are clearly visible hypocenters of the three destruction zones – and the positions of each of these hypocenters perfectly match their presumed positions as calculated before. Khalezov says that he was not alone in arriving at these conclusions in regard to the exact positioning of the nuclear demolition charges. Because there is one French writer – a certain Mr. William Tahlil, B.A. whose book in pdf format on the WTC nuclear demolition is available for download from <http://nucleardemolition.com> Khalezov shows one of Tahlil’s drawings where a nuclear explosion’s hypocenter is described to be exactly at the same spot as discussed above – i.e. in between the North Tower and the Marriott hotel, 50 meters below the lowest underground floor of the WTC. The interviewer asks whether William Tahlil actually claims it was a nuclear explosion of a certain “clandestine nuclear reactor”, not that of a nuclear charge. Khalezov laughs in response and says that it is not serious. A nuclear reactor could explode neither in a sense of an ordinary explosion, nor in a sense of a nuclear explosion because it does not contain any explosive material. It can only melt, but it can not explode. Nuclear reaction in a nuclear reactor and a nuclear reaction in a nuclear bomb are different and they also need a different quality of nuclear fuel. Khalezov says that this French author apparently knows that a nuclear reactor can not explode and even points to a preface of William Tahlil’s book where it is stated in a form of epigraph: “Ground Zero: a point on the ground directly under the explosion of a nuclear weapon” [added in the form of irony: *and not that of a nuclear “reactor”, isn’t*

so, dear Mr. William Tahil, B.A.?] Khalezov says that the fact that a nuclear reactor can not explode is elementary knowledge and it is known even to a school child. He says that something seems to be wrong in William Tahil's book, but he does not know what is wrong. Firstly there was no reason for the US Government to have such "clandestine" nuclear reactors under the Twin Towers, because the Towers had apparently enough electricity supplied to them. Secondly, even if they did have such nuclear reactors, there was no reason to keep them secret, because Tahil claims it was two "clandestine" nuclear reactors. Thirdly, it is not possible for a nuclear reactor "clandestine" or otherwise to explode. Nonetheless, despite his seemingly ridiculous claims of "two clandestine nuclear reactors" that allegedly resulted in "nuclear explosions" that pulverized the Twin Towers, Tahil strangely positioned one of his alleged "reactors" in exactly the right spot – in between the North Tower and the Marriott Hotel and he positioned it 50 meters below the Tower's foundations – i.e. exactly at the spot where a real 150 kiloton thermo-nuclear demolition charge was indeed positioned. The discussion moves back to the WTC-7 demolition. Khalezov again shows the big NOAA photograph where three hypocenters of three destruction zones are clearly seen (one of them under the WTC-7), and he shows another photograph of "Ground Zero" that clearly shows three distinct spots emitting vapors. One of these three spots is a spot of the WTC-7 and the other two – spots of the Twin Towers. He then shows one article on the Internet dated by December 3, 2001, in which a certain Charles Blaich, a Deputy Chief of the New York Fire Department claims that there were three spots of "deep underground fires", one located under the WTC-7. Besides, some strange chemicals vaguely named by a seditious name "two powerful ultra-violet absorbers" earmarked "to absorb high-energy emissions" were mixed into the water that was used by firefighters to extinguish these "deep underground fires" also under the spot of the WTC-7 according to Blaich. It is clear for those capable of reading between the lines that in this article the two apparent radioactivity absorbents were described and the mere fact that such strange "chemicals" were used also at the spot of the WTC-7 clearly points to the fact that the WTC-7 was demolished by the very same means as the Twin Towers. The article states that the fires were the "longest-burning structural fires in history" though the fires were "not typical by any means" and the fires were represented by "combustible debris mixed with twisted steel in a mass that may be 50 meters deep".

Part 17. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xbwZF-v_URU

Part 17. An official video animation by ABC is shown that purports to represent an official version of the Pentagon attack – the American Airlines Flight 77 approaches the Pentagon on a high altitude, makes an unprecedented sharp descent – a kind of high-speed downward spiral and then continues at full cruise speed parallel to the ground, toppling standing lamp-posts with its wings till it hits the wall of the Pentagon. A punched-out hole is shown that bears no signs of the plane's wings and that clearly pertains to a kind of a missile. Contemporary CNN footage is shown where a Senior Pentagon correspondent for CNN Jamie McIntyre reports live from the Pentagon lawn claiming that he did not see any sign of a plane having crashed anywhere near the Pentagon. The green Pentagon lawn is clean and pristine and the CNN's camera-man makes sure to show how intact the lawn is. It is clear that the CNN's reporter does not believe the Pentagon was hit by any plane. The next footage from NBC briefly shows the

Pentagon lawn before the collapse of its wall damaged on impact. The lawn is pristine without any signs of a “plane crash” whatsoever. Moreover, all lampposts (that would be toppled later to blame that on alleged “plane wings”) are still standing. The next footage shows how a former 9/11 Commissioner Tim Roemer affords a Freudian slip of the tongue saying that the Pentagon was hit by a missile, then correcting himself and continuing talking about a “passenger plane” as if nothing happened. Two contemporary witnesses are shown from a CBS clip who talk about a “huge explosion” without mentioning any passenger plane, moreover, one of the witnesses says that he thought it was a generator that malfunctioned and exploded. Yet another witness – not unknown Mike Walter from “USA Today” – in the next clip claims that “it was like a cruise missile with wings that went right there and slammed into the Pentagon”. From this point the discussion moves on the sunken Russian submarine “Kursk” and origins of the “Granit” missile. When asked to repeat what he stated in his book in regard to the “Kursk” missiles and missile silos, Khalezov proceeds to explain that the missiles were stolen from the submarine and by the time of the operation to recover the “Kursk” the missiles were no longer there and the top Russian officials apparently knew this fact very well. Therefore before the recovery operation had started, the Russian Navy commanders had sent a special unit of navy divers with a strange instruction – to fill the empty silos (where the “Granit” missiles were supposed to be) with certain fast-setting foam and then – to seal their lids. It was done with an apparent reason to hid the fact that the missiles were no longer there. However, the Russians were obliged to produce some official explanation to this strange action. The official version was that this fast setting foam was used to allegedly prevent the missiles from dangling during the submarine transportation to the port. With submarine already recovered and secured in the port, the Russian officials had no choice then but to continue with this what Khalezov calls “production”. The officials concocted a report that the missiles were allegedly so badly damaged that it was not possible to open the lids of their launching tubes and it was necessary to destroy the missiles along with their silos. However bizarre, this idea was carried out: the entire missile silos were cut out of the board of the submarine by means of welding, delivered to some secure location, laid in trenches and destroyed by portable nuclear devices (mini-nukes). To provide proof of these unprecedented claims Khalezov refers to two on-line news articles in Russian language supplied with English translations from which it is clear that: a) the Russians indeed destroyed the alleged “Granit” missiles along with their thermo-nuclear warheads and even launch-tubes; b) they indeed carried out their destruction without opening the silos that were cut “as is” from the submarine’s board; c) they apparently used some low-caliber nuclear munitions to actually destroy the silos, because it appears so from the context of the second article – due to the fact that local deer-breeders were advised by the Department of Civil Defense to take iodine during the abovementioned works. Khalezov also confirms that it would be logical to destroy the empty silos with nuclear munitions, because only a nuclear explosion could ensure the destruction of the silos completely, without leaving any evidence that could point out that there were no actual missiles (and neither their half-megaton thermo-nuclear warheads) inside the silos filled only with the fast-setting foam. Both news articles, however bizarre, corroborate Khalezov’s claims in regard to the stealing of all the missiles from the “Kursk”.

Part 18. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IwPhAEXNuOk>

Part 18. Asked if it is normal for the Russians to destroy missiles in such a manner, Khalezov answers that it is absolutely abnormal and if the missiles were indeed there, then some commission should have been created by the Russian Government. Such a commission should consist of the manufacturers of the missiles, and also manufacturers of their nuclear warheads, and specialists of the 12th Chief Directorate who are specialists in maintaining nuclear weapons and their registrar, and some missile specialists from the North Fleet, as well as some commanders of submarines which are of the same class as the “Kursk” and such a commission should evaluate the condition of the missiles and then to recommend what to do next. Perhaps, based on the actual condition of the missiles it could recommend just to clean the missiles and put them back in service, or to disassemble them, but in no case would it order to destroy them in such a manner. Asked is it normal to destroy nuclear materials used in warheads by such methods, Khalezov answers that it is not normal, because the nuclear materials are very expensive and whenever a warhead gets de-commissioned such materials would be used in the next generation of warheads, or just kept in a very secure manner for some future use. They are more expensive than gold, according to Khalezov, so why should someone destroy gold? Asked how expensive the materials are he answers that because they are not being sold at a market price, there is no market price for them, but, perhaps, a kilogram of weapon-grade Uranium costs a hundred thousand US dollars, while a kilogram of Plutonium costs may be 10 times as much. At least 20 kilogram of Plutonium should have been used in each of the 22 warheads destroyed in such a manner – so one can make his own calculations as to how many millions of dollars it could have been. Asked if it was embarrassing for the Russian Government to lose the missiles and the warheads, Khalezov answers that it was indeed extremely embarrassing; therefore the Russian Government decided to cover it up in such a manner. Asked does it mean that “terrorists” still have 22 missiles with thermo-nuclear warheads, Khalezov answers that they should have 21, because they have already spent one by firing it into the Pentagon on 9/11. However, whether the “terrorists” still have 21 or 19 is still an open question, because some US officials believe that there were allegedly 2 more warheads that stuck in the Twin Towers which were eventually turned to dust and now it is impossible to prove if they were there in reality or not. Asked what would happen if such a warhead should explode in London, Khalezov answers that it depends on the altitude. If it exploded at a high attitude, such a half-megaton explosion would destroy the entire city of London. If on ground level, may be less – may be 70% of it. It would be like a big Hiroshima – 20 times as much. Asked if he is ready to testify to his claims in regard to stolen missiles, Khalezov says that yes, he is ready to testify. In fact, he claims, he has already told about this fact to the US security officials, and they know it very well, but for some strange reason they did not want to continue this inquiry. It seems that they are satisfied with what they know.

Part 19. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AI2-vBcS17Q>

Part 19. The interviewer summarizes all evidence in the context of the 9/11 timetable – the two planes hit the Twin Towers, the unexploded thermo-nuclear warhead is found in the Pentagon, and the decision is made to demolish the Towers, because of the possibility that there could be similar nuclear devices in the upper floors. Khalezov corrects this by

saying that the US officials did not consider that as a “possibility”. At least so the FBI officials told him – that they were absolutely certain about it. They were absolutely sure about the fact that such nuclear devices were in the upper floors of the Towers, because the real warhead found in the Pentagon was the very tough means to convince them. He again refers to the contemporary 9/11 NBC video clip that was shown in part 06, where NBC’s Pat Dawson at 10.02 AM EST reveals what was told to him by Albert Turi, the Chief of Safety for the New York Fire Department. Pat Dawson quotes Turi as saying that he believes there were TWO so-called “secondary devices”. One of such “secondary devices” might have been on the planes that crashed into one of the Towers. Another of such “secondary devices” was probably planted into the buildings. The discussion moves on to the so-far unnoticed 9/11 mystery – the evacuation of the Sears Tower in Chicago that was first reported by CNN and also by Fox News at 10.02 AM, and which, perhaps, started a few minutes earlier (the South Tower collapsed only at 9.59 AM EST). Khalezov explains that the Sears Tower in Chicago was ordered to evacuate at that moment because it too had its own nuclear demolition scheme – similar to that of the WTC in New York. And the US officials, understandably, after taking the decision to collapse the Twin Towers with some people still inside were obliged to evacuate the Sears Tower which might easily follow in the same suit, and they did not want to kill more people. It is followed by CNN’s news clip shown live at 10.04 AM ET on 9/11 where CNN’s anchor Aaron Brown reports for the second time about the evacuation of the Sears Tower in Chicago with CNN’s text below which also confirms this fact. The interviewer asks if it is true that Khalezov knew about the nuclear demolition scheme of the Sears Tower. Khalezov answers that, to be honest, he knew for sure only about the nuclear demolition scheme of the World Trade Center in New York, because he knew it from his former military service. When it comes to his knowledge in regard to the Sears Tower he says he heard only rumors about that. However, even these rumors in the context of what happened on 9/11 and also in combination with the behavior of the US officials were quite revealing and there is little doubt in regard to the fact that the Sears Tower has its own in-built nuclear demolition scheme. Besides, Khalezov says, the building code of Chicago was similar to the building code of New York in this sense and unless a constructor could provide some satisfactory demolition scheme he would not be allowed to build a skyscraper in Chicago. Which probably explains it all, according to Khalezov.

Part 20. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nmepiFCbXfA>

Part 20. The discussion moves on to seismic signals that should have been produced by 150 kiloton underground nuclear charges. The interviewer suggests that these seismic signals should have been detected and come to notice of foreign governments, for example, the British Government. He refers to a famous seismogram and a corresponding table of seismic signals published on the web site of Columbia University’s Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, New York. Both – the actual seismogram and the table clearly point to two nuclear explosions of mini-nuke-yield at the time of the Twin Towers’ collapse. However, neither the seismogram, nor the corresponding table of 9/11 seismic events show any “mini-nuclear explosion” at the time of the WTC-7 collapse. Khalezov explains that these seismograms were bogus due to a variety of reasons. Firstly, the two picks that purported to represent the two nuclear explosions are simply too

perfect – perhaps they were made with a pen and a ruler. Secondly, the two “nuclear” picks obviously purported to represent explosions of “mini-nukes” of less than 1 kiloton yields, because their actual seismic magnitudes are depicted as being only 2.1 and 2.3, while the real nuclear explosions under the WTC were 150 kilotons that would produce magnitudes of at least above 5.7 on the Richter scale. Thirdly, because this supposed “evidence” fails to show the third nuclear explosion under the WTC-7, despite the fact that the WTC-7 was obviously demolished by the same means as the Twin Towers. Khalezov states that these seismograms and the seismic table are nothing but bogus evidence concocted by cheaters in order to support the second version of the so-called “truth” of 9/11 – i.e. the “confidential” claim of the US Government that the WTC was allegedly brought down by nuclear suit-cases of Osama bin Laden. However, he mentions that this bogus evidence does not match the actual second version of the so-called “truth”, because it fails to “reveal” that the WTC-7 too was demolished by the third alleged “mini-nuke” of Osama bin Laden. For example, the abovementioned article in the Spanish “El-Mundo” that also revealed the “second truth” was dealing with three alleged portable nuclear devices, while bogus evidence on the Columbia University web site is dealing only with two of such alleged mini-nukes. The interviewer refers to testimonies of some firefighters who felt the ground shaking prior to the WTC collapse and what they described was like the “feeling of a train running under their feet”. Khalezov refers to an official web site (pages of which are shown in the video) that deals with human feelings of seismic magnitudes. (It shall be mentioned that since this movie appeared on YouTube the US authorities ordered to remove both web pages dealing with seismic magnitudes and feelings of earthquakes and today they are no longer available on the web addresses shown in the video; however, Khalezov supplies pdf-printed versions of both web pages while they were still on-line, together with the actual video clips of his interview). According to the officially published data, seismic magnitudes of less than 3.0 on the Richter scale can’t be felt by human beings, but only by some special seismic devices. Which is hard proof that the abovementioned seismograms were fake – because the firefighters simply could not feel 2.1 and 2.3 seismic signals. Khalezov then uses the set of data from FEMA published on the web site to prove that such a “feeling of a train running under one’s feet” could only pertain to an earthquake well above 5.5 on the Richter scale. Then using another official table that shows magnitudes and corresponding TNT yields, Khalezov proves that what was felt by the firefighters prior to each of the Twin Towers’ collapse could only have been caused by nuclear explosions of well over 80 kilotons in TNT yield and by no means it could have been any mini-nukes. At the end of this part a contemporary 9/11 CNN clip is inserted where one of CNN’s producers Rose Arce who was at the scene of the WTC describes that shortly before the North Tower began to collapse, its top suddenly started to shake. It is followed by the famous clip by Etienne Sauret which shows the North Tower’s shaking 12 seconds before it started to come down in very good detail. Khalezov, at last, answers the first question – how would a foreign government treat the available seismograms. He says that the government will simply misinterpret them – to match the official US claims – in the same way that Columbia University did with its alleged seismic “evidence”.

Part 21. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jndXqbR-w0Q>

Part 21. The discussion moves on again to the point that it was hard to believe that the incredibly thick double-walled steel supporting columns of the WTC suddenly turned into complete microscopic dust that allowed the Towers to collapse at freefall speed. However, it is even harder to believe that such steel columns could have been penetrated by aluminum planes which completely disappeared inside. This is followed by a famous clip from Evan Fairbanks' video that shows from beneath the South Tower how a plane approaches and penetrates it and how a man caught into the frame reacted on that. It is repeated twice and it is clear that the man reacts neither to the sound of the plane on its approach, nor to the sound of an aluminum plane cutting through the WTC steel perimeters. It is very obvious that the man reacts only on hearing an explosion above – i.e. his reaction coincides with the appearance of those trade-mark orange Hollywood-style fireballs that suddenly burst from the South Tower. It is followed by another famous video clip – an interview with the WTC on-site construction manager Frank Albert de Martini. In this interview, recorded in January, 2001, de Martini claims that the WTC was designed to sustain the impact of the fully loaded largest commercial airliner at the time – the Boeing 707 (which was even bigger in size than the Boeing 767 that allegedly toppled the Twin Towers on 9/11). De Martini explains that the plane can not penetrate the intense [steel] grid of the Towers' perimeters. Another contemporary 9/11 clip by CNN is shown – one of the earliest. It shows how Fox reporter Dick Oliver on the street tries to get some information about the first explosion in the North Tower from several passers-by. A woman stops and talks to him. She says that she witnessed the explosion around the 80th floor and a large section of the building was blown out. On Oliver's question if it was hit by something, she firmly answers "no". It was inside, she repeats it twice in an affirmative manner – it was inside, because everything was coming out. Another famous 9/11 video clip is shown. In it soon after the North Tower's collapse an angry passer-by interrupts a staged interview by Fox TV channel. The passer-by says angrily to the Fox reporter that it was not the second plane, but a bomb and he repeated it at least three times – he saw the explosion with his eyes and it was not a plane, but a bomb. Then another video clip is inserted that shows an excerpt of George W. Bush's 15 September 2006 Rose Garden Speech. In this speech Bush, who apparently talks to some security officials, refers to certain "valuable information" in regard to "plane attacks on buildings inside the US". According to Bush the attacks were designed in a manner to ensure that "explosives went off" at points high enough to prevent people trapped above from escaping. It appears from this clip that Bush is certain that the WTC Towers were wired with explosives designed to imitate "planes" impacts and he talks about it as of a matter of fact. The discussion then comes back to the "planes". The interviewer refers to the fact that in his book Khalezov made claims that there were no planes and that the actual planes were shot down by the US Government and asks Khalezov to clarify that claim of his. Khalezov answers that he believes that the two planes that were supposed to have hit the Twin Towers were stolen, they were empty and they were made to sink somewhere in the Atlantic Ocean to hide evidence, while the planes' images were used for digital manipulation with videos showing their alleged impacts. Another famous CNN video clip (actually not CNN's own, but by "courtesy WABS") is inserted here that purports to show the second "plane" hitting the South Tower. In that clip there are at least two clear signs of digital manipulation, which Khalezov points out. One of them that in the middle

of the impact scene there are some completely black frames. The second one is that the word “Live” which before the impact was on a red banner suddenly appears on a blue banner, instead, after the “plane’s” impact. Moreover, Khalezov suggests listening carefully to the discussion between the two CNN reporters which is the sound-track of the above clip. The two CNN reporters, who apparently saw things live, but did not see that “courtesy WABS” clip talked only about an explosion in the South Tower and neither of them mentions any “plane” or even hints that the Tower might have been hit by something. This part ends with the ABC clip that shows the second plane hitting the South Tower, however the ABC’s Dan Dahler who is on the WTC spot clearly states that he did not see any plane, it was an explosion.

Part 22. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JVCpve8SMMY>

Part 22. The discussion disproving the “planes” theory moves on. A virtually unknown clip from the contemporary 9/11 NBC’s news release is inserted. The NBC news anchor cites American Airlines as saying that it has identified its two planes that crashed into the Twin Towers. The first of their planes was Flight 11. The second plane that crashed into the Twin Towers was American Airlines Flight 77 (which clearly contradicts the later official version according to which Flight 77 allegedly hit the Pentagon in Washington, not the WTC South Tower in New York). Then the NBC news anchor continues to report in regard to United Airlines. United Airlines says that its Flight 93 has crashed somewhere in Pennsylvania, while United Flight 175 has also crashed, according to the Airlines, but it does not say where it has crashed. NBC shows at that point the Pentagon’s undamaged lawn after the attack – one of the earliest footages, before the Pentagon’s wall had collapsed. What is interesting in that clip is that all lampposts are still standing (later they will be toppled to imitate alleged “wings” of the “plane”). Another NBC contemporary clip is inserted here that describes the Pentagon attack. The NBC’s reporter on site cites an eye-witness as saying that he saw an “aircraft” slamming into the site of the Pentagon and there were no marking at all on the side of the plane (while the American Airlines Flight 77 that was later alleged to strike the Pentagon would have distinct red-colored markings on its side that would be impossible to mistake with anything else). Then the discussion moves on to the remaining two planes – Flights 77 and 93. Khalezov says that he believes the two planes were shot down by the US Government in the panic that followed the 9/11 events. A contemporary 9/11 NBC clip is inserted at that point where it is claimed that one of the Flight 93 passengers allegedly called his wife from his mobile phone (a contemporary Motorola TAC AMPS mobile phone is shown at that point by NBC to refer to what kind of phone was allegedly used in that call) and informed her that the plane was hijacked and the passengers are now preparing to tackle the hijackers. Khalezov comments on this point by explaining that a mobile phone can only connect to a tower (a center of a mobile cell) within a maximum of 2 kilometers distance. When a passenger aircraft flies at its cruise altitude (which is over 8 kilometers) it is simply too far to reach any cellular network on the ground and it is simply technically impossible to connect any mobile phone of this kind when on board in order to make such a call as claimed. Khalezov then proceeds to explain that Flight 93 must have been shot down with cannons, not with a missile, because of the pattern of its destruction. It was disintegrated while still in the air and it fell in many small pieces covering a large area. Only a big explosion could cause a plane to be disintegrated in

such a manner, or, the only other way that the plane could have been cut in pieces would have been by a rapid-firing gun that is installed on jet-fighters, in addition to missiles. Moreover, Khalezov claims that it could only be a cannon, not a missile, because it is impossible to shoot down your own plane using your own missile. All modern missiles are designed to recognize the so-called IFF identification which is being constantly transmitted by any and every friendly aircraft, and no missile could lock on its own plane, due to this arrangement. It is technically impossible – to shoot your own plane using your own missile. In order to shoot your own plane you have to use cannon, because it is manual. And it seems that this was the case with Flight 93. Firstly, the pattern of its destruction clearly points to the usage of cannons. Secondly, if you carefully review the timetable of 9/11 events you will notice that one of the US jet-fighters sent to intercept hijacked planes returned to its base with its entire cannon munitions spent. So far no one has offered any plausible explanation as to why the cannon munitions were spent in that case. This part of the presentation ends with a certain video clip with an apparent Freudian slip of the tongue – where Donald Rumsfeld, the then Secretary of Defense, talks about the plane “shot down over Pennsylvania”.

Part 23. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9Oj78xoLHj0>

Part 23. The discussion moves on to the alleged hijackers. The interviewer stresses that in order to hijack planes one must have some hijackers. It is discussed (apparently based on some information revealed in Khalezov’s book) that in each of the 4 hijacking crews named by the FBI at least one or even 2 hijackers were later found alive, while some other ones have alibis, thanks to FBI blunders (which in effect nullify the entire claim that there were any hijackers whatsoever). Two pages from the 9/11 Commission Report are shown with photographs of all alleged hijackers as claimed by the 9/11 Commission. Out of the 19 alleged hijackers 8 are confirmed as being alive, with another 6 having alibis of various kinds (which is all marked on the two pages with red and blue correspondingly). The number of still unmarked hijackers remains as low as only 5. Khalezov says that if these hijackers were named as such by the 9/11 Commission Report and then later they were found alive this fact by default dismisses the entire Report of the 9/11 Commission as a lie. The interviewer agrees with that. The discussion moves on to talk about several individual hijackers. Some remarkable ones are Ziad Jarrah, a Christian, not even a Muslim (this one was actually a known Mossad agent operating in Lebanon) and Satam al Sukami, whose passport was allegedly found at ground zero on September 12, 2001, being remarkably undamaged amidst the pulverized and burned out remains of the World Trade Center. Khalezov comments that since Sukami’s passport was undoubtedly planted there by the authorities, this fact automatically exonerates its owner from any complicity and provides him the clearest alibi. The interviewer agrees with that. The interviewer asks if Khalezov’s opinion is that there were no flights involved, and that all the alleged hijackers were innocent. Khalezov answers that perhaps not all of the hijackers were totally innocent, it appears that Mohammed Atta, who was an agent of the Pakistani ISI, was not innocent – he probably agreed voluntarily to participate in that show. The interviewer clarifies that this is indeed Mohammed Atta, who received prior to the 9/11 attacks one hundred thousand US dollars transferred to his account by a senior official within the ISI. Khalezov confirms that and comments that if the American FBI believes that the Pakistani ISI indeed supported the 9/11 hijackers,

then the FBI should accuse the Pakistani secret services of supporting the hijackers and proceed against them very seriously. But it apparently did not happen. Which means this is proof of their collaboration. Moreover, the Americans did not even question that General – Lt. General Mahmood Ahmed, the chief of the Pakistani ISI – as to why he actually sent the money to one of the hijackers and why should the 9/11 hijackers receive funds from the Pakistani secret services. However, the US officials did not question him despite the fact that on 9/11 this General was in the US having breakfast with one of the US Senators; so, in fact, he was quite handy to be questioned if the Americans really wanted to. The interviewer suggests that if the US Government did something really awful then it had no choice than to come up with some planted evidence to cover up the truth. Khalezov agrees with that and says that naming the alleged hijackers was purely an act of covering up the 9/11 truth. Because after the nuclear demolition of the World Trade Center the American Government was put in such a desperate situation that it could produce any kind of lie just to distract the public attention from the real nuclear explosions in Manhattan, and the entire Report of the 9/11 Commission is merely a part of such distraction. The interviewer asks if what the US Government was doing was merely a reaction to something else done by other people and the US Government was innocent in regard to the 9/11 perpetration. Khalezov says that it was so and he personally does not believe the US Government was the 9/11 culprit; he believes the US Government was rather a 9/11 “victim”, put into an extremely desperate situation, so that it had no choice than to be involved in that kind of ridiculous cover-up (he nods towards the 9/11 Commission Report laying at the table). The interviewer asks what Khalezov could say in regard to the US Government’s position after 9/11, particularly in regard to various post-9/11 discussions held between the US Government and the British Government, as well as the governments of Israel, France and Russia. Khalezov says that it is very difficult to answer this, because he does not know. He says he does not like to speculate, he could only testify to what he knows for sure. He refers to his book by saying that most what is said in that book he knew for sure. He says he has done as he promised – i.e. revealed in the book WHO carried out 9/11 and HOW he did it. However, when it comes to this kind of discussion, apparently held behind closed doors, it is difficult to answer and he does not want to speculate. Khalezov says he could guess that discussions between the US Government and the Russian Government were obviously concerning the Soviet-made “Granit” missile with its thermo-nuclear warhead that was fired into the Pentagon – i.e. concerning the points where this missile actually came from and who should be held responsible for that action. However, even this is only Khalezov’s guess, because he was not a witness to that discussion. But when it comes to discussions between the Americans and the British, the Americans and the Israelis, and the Americans and the French he says simply does not know. The interviewer asks Khalezov if in his opinion there is any relationship between 9/11 and any Muslim terrorists, Al-Qaeda, or Saddam Hussein. Khalezov says that according to contemporary documents, also available for public use, the US Government at September 11, 2001, about noon time, had already attempted to link Saddam Hussein to the 9/11 perpetration. He says it is also described in his book. However strangely, if you read an official review of the 9/11 events – the Report of the 9/11 Commission – it appears that Saddam Hussein has absolutely nothing to do with the 9/11. The 9/11 Commission Report blames 9/11 on Osama bin Laden and his so-called Al-Qaeda, instead. But if you visit an official FBI

web site, the list of 10 Most Wanted persons, you will find out that Osama bin Laden is not wanted by the FBI for 9/11. The FBI clearly states that it has no evidence to charge Osama bin Laden with 9/11. As one of the 10 Most Wanted on the FBI's list Osama is charged only with organizing bombings against the US Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998. Khalezov provides a live screenshot of the FBI web site and it appears that indeed Osama bin Laden is not wanted by the FBI for 9/11; he is only wanted for the 1998 bombings. The screenshot shows that Osama bin Laden's FBI poster was updated on November 2001, meaning that the FBI by November 2001 has had no evidence to link Osama to 9/11 and so it remains up to this day (March 2010, when this video-presentation was edited). Thus, Khalezov says, it is not easy at all to answer this question because the FBI statement contradicts the 9/11 Commission statement, and the reality shows actually a third thing. The US war against Afghanistan under an official pretext to capture Osama bin Laden in connection with 9/11 contradicts the FBI evidence. While the US war against Iraq contradicts the Report of the 9/11 Commission, because it does not link Saddam Hussein to the 9/11 perpetration. Nonetheless, the US Government went to war against Iraq to look for weapons of mass destruction, which in 8 years they haven't found.

Part 24. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=313JZU9FTs4>

Part 24. The interviewer wanted to know what happened with the cavities underneath the World Trade Center. Khalezov answers that at first the cavities were filled with some hot liquid material which resulted from molten materials and from cooling down of gaseous materials produced by the nuclear explosions. These extremely hot materials would retain some temperature for about a year, but eventually they would cool down and set as solid matter. This explains molten steel found at ground zero even a few months later. The 150 kiloton explosion would release a lot of energy, according to Khalezov, and as a result it would be like a huge pot, hundreds of meters deep and filled with some hot materials, which understandably would take time to cool down. A famous video clip from "Ground Zero" is inserted here where two female ground zero responders explain to a reporter that heat at ground zero was so intense that it melted the boots of male responders in only a few hours. The interviewer asks if now, since 8 years has passed, the cavities have been filled with something? Khalezov answers that definitely, the cavities were filled with concrete perhaps mixed with certain chemicals to absorb the radioactivity, though exact details he does not know. However, he says that the cavity must have been filled anyway, because it would be dangerous to keep them intact in the middle of Manhattan. Firstly, they had to fill the cavities in order to prevent the radioactivity from reaching the earth's surface and injuring people. Secondly, they can't afford to leave these cavities because they might cause the collapse of some surrounding structures. That is why they had to be fixed anyway. The interviewer asks – if someone disbelieves Khalezov's explanation in regard to the WTC collapse and decides to drill a borehole through the cavities filling up the external walls of the cavities – what would one find in this case? Khalezov answers that they would find the former liquid and gaseous materials now set as solid matter and this material would likely resemble a kind of volcanic glass. This will be the proof that underground nuclear explosions indeed occurred there. Some materials would retain their radioactivity. Once you get to this kind of material you could test it for radioactivity. The discussion moves on to health effects at ground zero. Khalezov refers to an article "Death

by Dust” found on the Internet (a live screenshot of it also shown in the video) in which one ground zero responder describes that while he was working there he saw that some FBI agents visited ground zero being dressed in full hazmat suits, complete with head-masks, moreover, additionally sealed shut with some duct tape, while the rest of the people there were totally unprotected. Khalezov says that actually this was the very thing that eventually triggered him into writing this book – he says that those FBI agents apparently knew what he knew but they did not want to reveal the truth to the public. So, he decided to reveal the truth, instead. The article describes that the ground zero responder, NYPD John Walcott got sick with leukemia after working on ground zero and he was required to have a bone marrow transplantation because his own blood was no longer regenerating. Otherwise he would not be able to survive. Khalezov explains that it was an apparent result of radiation poisoning because people who worked on ground zero unprotected freely inhaled radioactive vapors that eventually caused chronic radiation sickness. The interviewer asks why would not doctors notice something wrong when an unusually big number of people who worked on and lived around ground zero would seek medical help – all with strange, but similar symptoms? Khalezov answers that it is not necessary that doctors would understand that it had something to do with radiation. It is because in this case the radiation sickness will be chronic rather than acute. It will be apparent not immediately, but in a year or two and it could reveal itself differently – someone might have cancer, someone might have another kind of cancer, some will have blood diseases, just generally bad feeling, and whenever they go to the doctors, the doctors could diagnose them anything, unrelated to radiation. Besides, Khalezov says, that we should presume that some doctors especially appointed to treat the ground zero responders might be a part of the cover-up. They might sign some non-disclosure contracts which will prohibit them from diagnosing their patients with radiation sickness and just to create some other stories, instead, which is quite easy for doctors to do.

Part 25. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uYeDkGWw9xk>

Part 25. The interviewer asks if people subjected to radiation poisoning would feel sick immediately – the next day. Khalezov answers that it is not so. There are two different radiation sicknesses – an acute and a chronic one and you must not confuse the two. The interviewer asks him to explain the difference. Khalezov proceeds to explain that people could be subjected to radiation exposure in two different ways. One way – on account of being hit by a hard front of ionizing penetrating radiation instantly emitted from a hypocenter of an atmospheric nuclear explosion. The second way – on account of spending some time on radioactively contaminated areas and accumulating some dose of acquired radiation. To feel sick one would need to get, either instantly, or accumulated, a dose of gamma-radiation of at least 50 Roentgens. The officials who secretly monitored radiation safety at ground zero knew this digit very well. They knew that if they let people work there without any radiation control whatsoever it would result very soon in multiple cases of acute radiation sickness which would be immediately noticeable. In order to avoid this, the US officials secretly implemented personal radiation control by issuing to each ground zero responder individual dosimeters in the disguise of alleged “air-monitors”. These alleged “air-monitors” had to be issued to every worker in the morning and taken from him every evening for alleged “re-calibration”. Khalezov refers also to an article published on the Internet (and also shown in the video) where it is

disclosed by former ground zero medical specialists that such alleged “air-monitors” have been indeed used in the manner described. However, Khalezov says, it would be just ridiculous to believe this, and it is very clear that these so-called “air-monitors” were in fact the individual dosimeters that indeed had to be collected from the workers every evening to take readings and to calculate summary radiation dose per each worker. Once the officials who secretly monitored the radiation safety saw that the personal accumulated dose of a certain worker is nearing the dangerous digit and he would soon become noticeably sick, they would find some pretext to transfer him to some other location where he would no longer be subjected to gamma-radiation. In this way those who monitored radiation safety at ground zero managed to prevent the workers from acute radiation sickness. However, the chronic radiation sickness is a totally different thing. The acute radiation sickness is usually caused by huge doses of gamma-radiation. All dosimeters also used to measure only gamma-radiation, while ignoring beta- and alpha-radiations. It is because gamma-radiation is the most penetrative; it would penetrate even a hazmat suit. That is why people who work on radioactively contaminated areas have to observe safe doses of gamma-radiation even when wearing hazmat suits, because the hazmat suit does not help against gamma-radiation. However, hazmat suits effectively protect people from alpha- and beta- radiations, particularly they prevent people from inhaling and ingesting microscopic particles that are radioactively contaminated and emit alpha- and beta- radiations. That is exactly why the FBI agents wore the full hazmat suits complete with head-masks, moreover, additionally sealed shut with the duct tape when visiting ground zero as described in the abovementioned article “Death by Dust”. Irrespective of the gamma-radiation level all people should have worn full hazmat suits all time when working at ground zero. However, it was not so at Ground Zero in Manhattan. The ground zero responders continuously inhaled radioactive vapors which contained microscopic particles that would continue to irradiate them from inside their bodies with the most dangerous alpha- and beta- radiations. Eventually it would damage their bodies beyond repair and in a year or two their sickness would become obvious. This is the difference between the acute and the chronic radiation sickness. While the acute radiation sickness could be avoided by strict observance of gamma-radiation doses, the chronic radiation sickness could be avoided by wearing a full hazmat suit, complete with head-mask. The second component was not implemented at Ground Zero in Manhattan; that is why all these responders suffer now from chronic radiation sickness.

Part 26. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J8CjvnMVOa8>

Part 26. The discussion about radiation effects and possible reactions by medical doctors continues. Khalezov mentions that many people who suffer now from chronic radiation sickness are now trying to sue the US Government, but they claim that the Government did not properly inform them about the dangers of “asbestos dust”, “benzene”, or anything else, except radiation. The interviewer asks if Khalezov believes that all of them suffer from some form of radiation sickness. Khalezov replies that it is an apparent chronic radiation sickness, because it was “ground zero”, after all, i.e. a place of a nuclear explosion, and the people began to work there in the first few days, being totally unprotected. At this point he again shows a page from the biggest pre-9/11 dictionary defining ground zero as “the point on the surface of the earth or water directly below, directly above, or at which an atomic or hydrogen bomb explodes”. The interviewer asks

how long would the vapors continue for? Khalezov answers the vapors would last as long as it is hot inside the cavities. The interviewer asks if it could be a year? Khalezov replies, that it seems that they would cool them down in about five or six months, because some efforts were made to cool them down by pouring water inside the cavities. Asked if such radioactive vapors would also affect Manhattan residents, in addition to the ground zero responders, he answers that of course, they would, but it is known that all Manhattan residents from dangerous areas were evacuated and not allowed to come back for at least six months. Which is still short, in Khalezov's opinion; he says that they should have been away for at least two years, not just six months. The interviewer asks, if some of these Manhattan residents inhale radioactive vapors and become sick, they would not go to doctors that were specially appointed to treat ground zero responders. They would go, instead, just to any doctor down the road. Would not it then occur to the innocent doctors that something was wrong with the ground zero area because too many people with similar symptoms were beginning to seek medical help? Khalezov replies that it is unlikely. Because doctors are not necessarily specialists in nuclear explosions. What doctors see are symptoms, they do not see the cause. Besides, the doctors also have some internal instructions. Let's say certain doctors received some circular where it is stated that all people who live around ground zero were affected by asbestos dust. The doctors would believe that circular. It is easy to cheat people, including doctors, Khalezov says. The interviewer agrees. The discussion moves to the actual vapors that were visible even from space and a satellite photograph is shown where plumes of vapor ascending from ground zero on Manhattan are clearly visible. The interviewer stresses the point that in his book Khalezov noticed that these were not black smoke, but vapors. Khalezov says that of course, they were vapor because they were white. The interviewer refers to the point that Khalezov observed in his book precisely the three hot places where the nuclear charges were activated. Khalezov says that this particular spectrogram showing the three hot spots under the WTC-1, 2 and 7 he referred to was found somewhere on the Internet and it was not composed by him. However, when he compares that hot spots spectrogram with the photograph by NOAA of September 23, 2001 (the one discussed in part 16), he found out that the three hot spots exactly coincided with the three positions of the nuclear charges that were used to demolish the Twin Towers and the WTC-7. In this video the spectrogram is made half-transparent and placed on top of the NOAA photograph. And indeed it is clear that the three hot spots on it perfectly coincide with the positions of the three nuclear demolition charges described in part 16. The interviewer asks once more if it could only be nuclear devices that could create these hot spots? Khalezov's answer is that it is impossible to create such zones of high temperatures underground that would be sustained for several months. Where else would you get such huge energy unless you use a thermo-nuclear explosion of over 100 kiloton? The interviewer says he is glad that high energy issue was mentioned, because he has a third-party report by some physicists who also claim that it would not be possible to achieve this kind of effect regarding the WTC destruction from the point of the energy required, unless nuclear explosions were used. This confirms Khalezov's claims, he said. Khalezov answers that yes, indeed, many 9/11 researchers independently arrived at the same conclusions as him with only one difference: they needed to guess that it was nuclear explosions, while he did not need to guess, because he knew it for certain from his former service. The interviewer says that there is something else that makes Khalezov's book unique. It is that he is going to name

in it the real perpetrator of 9/11. Khalezov confirms this. The interviewer thanks him for the interview.

END.

The video ends with an invitation to visit web sites:

www.911thology.com

www.911thology.cn

for more information.